

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 4, 11 and 12 are amended, and claims 13 and 14 are added. Support for amended claims 1, 2, 4, 11 and 12 and new claims 13 and 14 can be found, for example, in Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0030], [0031], and [0037].

The courtesies extended to Applicants representative by Examiners Duong and Tran at the interview held February 7, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Yamazaki et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,825,820). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1 and for similarly recited features in claims 2, 4, 11 and 12, and as agreed during the personal interview, Fig. 14B of Yamazaki only discloses a schematic view of the wiring diagram without a disclosure as to the relative widths of the lines in any of the line forming regions. Thus, Yamazaki does not teach nor make it possible to infer that the sum of the widths of a plurality of lines formed in one line forming region is approximately the same as the sum of the widths of a plurality of lines formed in another line forming region.

With respect to claim 3, Yamazaki does not teach at least one power line and at least one scan line being formed in at least one line forming region of the plurality of line forming regions.

As can be seen in Fig. 14B of Yamazaki, Yamazaki teaches power lines (power source feed lines 914) and data lines (source signal lines 912) being formed in the vertical line feeding regions and only scan lines (source signal lines 913) being formed in the horizontal line feeding regions. Therefore, because the scan lines run perpendicular to the power lines,

Yamazaki does not teach at least one power line and at least one scan line being formed in at least one line forming region of the plurality of line forming regions, as recited in claim 3.

Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner should note, as discussed in the specification, for example at paragraphs [0030] to [0033], and in particular at the end of paragraph [0033], the voltage requirements of pixels of different colors are not the same. Thus, because the voltage requirements of differing colored pixels are different, the width of the voltage lines to pixels of different colors is varied accordingly. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to ensure that the sum of the widths of a plurality of lines formed in one line forming region is approximately the same as the sum of the widths of a plurality of lines formed in another line forming region, as recited in amended claims 1, 2, 4, 11 and 12.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John A. Radi
Registration No. 59,345

JAO:JAR/tbm

Date: February 15, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--